United Nations S/2000/1016

Security Council

Distr.: General
24 October 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 19 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to attach herewith an article from the *New York Post* dated 15 October 2000, entitled "Would Bill launch missiles to pull Al from the fire?" (see annex).

The article stated that the allegation by the United States Administration regarding Al-Shifa Pharmaceutical Factory, destroyed by the United States on 20 August 1998, has turned out to be a lie. Too late, alas, for the suffering Sudanese who depended on medicine made at the plant.

I should appreciate it if you would circulate this letter and its annex as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Eltatih **Erwa**
Permanent Representative

00-70614 (E) 241000

Annex to the letter dated 19 October 2000 from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

WOULD BILL LAUNCH MISSILES TO PULL AL FROM THE FIRE?

News Article by **NYPOST** posted on October 15, 2000 at 11:23:50. EST (-5 GMT)

WOULD BILL LAUNCH MISSILES TO PULL AL FROM THE FIRE?

Sunday,October 15,2000 ROD DREHER New York Post

NOW is the time for all medicine factory employees in the Muslim world to stay home from work. At least until after Tuesday night's final presidential debate.

Given the Clinton administration's shameful record, there is every reason to expect Third World blood to be shed to save Al Gore's flagging bid for the presidency.

To be sure, the prospect of Osama bin Laden and his fanatical cohorts turned into terrorist tartare by U.S. bombs is deeply satisfying to contemplate.

And the cowards who murdered the men and women of the USS Cole have given the United States every reason to hit the guilty back hard, as we must.

But who can trust Clinton to do it right, to act on hard facts and clear principle unsullied by selfishness? Our dog-wagging commander-in-chief is no stranger to committing acts of war to protect himself politically.

As Christopher Hitchens points out in his devastatinganti-Clinton screed "No One Left to Lie to," this president fired cruise missiles three times at foreigners on days when impeachment news was bad.

* On Aug. 20, 1998, as Monica Lewinsky prepared to go before the grand jury and three days after Clinton's non-apology TV apology fell flat, the president ordered a missile attack on a pharmaceutical plant in Sudan.

The administration said the factory was used to make chemical weapons. That turned out to be a lie - too late, alas, for the suffering Sudanese who depended on medicine made at that plant.

* That same night, Clinton sent a barrage of expensive cruise missiles against purported terrorist training camps in Afghanistan. There was minimal damage, and one wonders why, if not for political reasons, a costly, fruitless attack was ordered in such haste.

* On Dec. 15, 1998, Clinton ordered a missile attack on Baghdad, ostensibly to punish Saddam Hussein for not complying with U.N. weapons inspectors. Did Saddam have it coming? Absolutely.

But he had it coming for a long time. It was curious indeed that the missiles went flying as the House was set to take up the impeachment debate, which was postponed for a few days.

Strangely enough, the missiles stopped falling after the House impeachment vote showed Republicans would not be intimidated.

Now, here we are less than a month away from Election Day, with the Mideast crisis putting Gore in a bad position on several fronts.

Military readiness, for one. As The Post's Bob McManus discussed in his column Friday, the Cole incident indicates a Navy stretched too thin, and unprepared to counter threats in the post-Cold War world.

Second, the prospect of a wider Mideast war is causing oil prices to spike and the stock market to tremble. A new Arab-Israeli war could cause the OPEC nations to shut off the West's oil pipeline.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve, released by Clinton to shield Gore from SUV drivers angry over high gas prices, was supposed to be for emergencies like this. As the Mideast situation deteriorates, that Clinton decision looks to have imperiled national security for the sake of a self-serving political stunt.

Don't be surprised if the U.S. military strikes what we will be told is a terrorist target sometime between now and the start of Tuesday's debate, which should have an unusually large audience given the events of last week.

Any attempt by George W. Bush to use the Mideast debacle to make sober, legitimate criticism of Clinton-Gore military and geopolitical policies will be met with pious demagoguery by scoundrel, pseudo-patriotic Democrats.

I hope I'm wrong. But we have learned by now never to put anything past Clinton when his political legacy is at stake, as it certainly is in the Bush-Gore referendum.

Team Bush had better be ready. So should the American people.